DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 430 758 RC 021 989

AUTHOR	Howley-Rowe, Caitlin
TITLE	Evaluation of Quest Elementary School Network Rally, February 1998.
INSTITUTION	Appalachia Educational Lab., Charleston, WV.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	1998-08-00
NOTE	39p.
CONTRACT	RJ96006001
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative (142) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Action Research; Change Agents; Change Strategies; Collegiality; *Educational Change; Educational Cooperation; Elementary Education; *Elementary Schools; *Interschool Communication; Listservs; *Networks; Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; *Regional Cooperation; Self Evaluation (Groups)
IDENTIFIERS	Reflective Inquiry; *School Improvement Teams

ABSTRACT

As part of its contract to develop a framework for continuous school improvement in its four-state region (Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia), Appalachia Educational Laboratory staff designed the Quest project. Based upon principles of inquiry, collaboration, and action research, Quest supports and investigates ongoing school improvement efforts through conferences (renamed rallies), summer symposia, a Scholars program, visits to participating schools, communication via listserv and mailings, and the creation of a Quest network of schools. The second elementary school network rally was held February 22-24, 1998, in Lexington, Kentucky. Thirty-nine administrators, staff, teachers, and parents from 9 schools attended, including 27 who had attended the first conference/rally in November, 1997. Evaluation data were generated by evaluator participant observation, unstructured interviews, written feedback forms, and pre-rally and follow-up questionnaires. Data indicate that the conference's four goals--reconnect with colleagues, think about student learning, create a creed embodying shared beliefs about student learning, and commit to action--were well met. Attendees reported productive interactions, found the focus on student learning useful, said that creating creeds of their collective beliefs about student learning was meaningful, and indicated that the rally offered them inspiration and support for their improvement efforts. Recommendations are made for improving future rallies. Appendices present feedback forms, pre-rally and follow-up questionnaires, and the evaluation standards checklist. Contains 12 references. (Author/TD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 430 758

Evaluation of QUEST Elementary School Network Rally, February 1998

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Caitlin Howley-Rowe

Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc.
P.O. Box 1348 • Charleston WV 25325 • 800-624-9120

RC021989

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Evaluation of QUEST Elementary School Network Rally, February 1998

by:

Caitlin Howley-Rowe
Research Assistant

August 1998

QUEST Project
Appalachia Educational Laboratory
Post Office Box 1348
Charleston, West Virginia 25325

RC 021989

AEL's mission is to link the knowledge from research with the wisdom from practice to improve teaching and learning. AEL serves as the Regional Educational Laboratory for Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia. For these same four states, it operates both a Regional Technology in Education Consortium and the Eisenhower Regional Consortium for Mathematics and Science Education. In addition, it serves as the Region IV Comprehensive Technical Assistance Center and operates the ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools.

Information about AEL projects, programs, and services is available by writing or calling AEL.

Appalachia Educational Laboratory
Post Office Box 1348
Charleston, West Virginia 25325-1348
304/347-0400
800/624-9120
304/347-0487 (Fax)
aelinfo@ael.org
http://www.ael.org

This publication is based on work sponsored wholly or in part by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U. S. Department of Education, under contract number RJ96006001. Its contents do not necessarily reflect the views of OERI, the Department, or any other agency of the U. S. Government.

AEL is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY ii

INTRODUCTION 1

METHODOLOGY 3

RALLY ACTIVITIES 5

- Day One 5
- Day Two 7
- Day Three 9

FINDINGS 12

- Comparative Findings 12
- Achievement of Rally Goals 13
  - Goal One: Reconnect with One Another 13
  - Goal Two: Think about Student Learning 14
  - Goal Three: Create a Creed Embodying Shared Beliefs about Student Learning 15
  - Goal Four: Commit to Action 16
- Follow-Up 17

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 20

- Conclusions 20
- Recommendations 21

REFERENCES 23

APPENDICES 24

- A: Feedback Forms
- B: Pre-Rally Questionnaire
- C: Follow-Up Questionnaire
- D: Completed Evaluation *Standards* Checklist

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

As part of its contract to develop a framework for continuous school improvement in its four-state Region, Appalachia Educational Laboratory (AEL) staff designed the QUEST project. Based upon principles of inquiry, collaboration, and action research, QUEST proposes to support and investigate ongoing school improvement efforts through bi-annual conferences (which staff renamed rallies), summer symposia, a Scholars program, visits to participating schools, communication via listserv and mailings, and the creation of a QUEST network of schools. This evaluation report describes and assesses the second elementary school network rally, convened February 22-24, 1998.

Thirty-nine people attended the rally, 27 (69%) of whom had participated in the first rally held in November 1997. Seven principals, one assistant principal, one central office staff member, one community member, three support staff, eighteen teachers, and eight parents from a total of nine schools participated in the February rally.

The rally was evaluated in terms of whether and to what extent the conference goals were met. To this end, a variety of data was gathered: field notes were taken during evaluator participant observation of all conference activities; participants completed a pre-rally questionnaire, two written feedback forms, and a follow-up questionnaire administered several months after the rally; and unstructured interviews were conducted throughout the rally. The follow-up questionnaire also enabled assessment of the impact QUEST had upon participating schools.

Analysis of the feedback data revealed that participants thought the rally goals had been well met. Attendees reported that they had productive interactions with each other and QUEST staff, and that they found the rally focus on student learning useful and appropriate. In addition, participants created creeds concerning their collective beliefs about what supports student learning, an activity most said had been meaningful. Following the rally, many participants reported that the rally had offered them inspiration and support as they continued their various school improvement efforts.

Based upon these data, the evaluator concluded that the rally for elementary schools had continued to provide support and encouragement to those undertaking continuous school improvement. Recommendations included strategies for increasing participant use of the QUEST listserv, modifying the pace of rally activities, moderating participant discussions about the relationship between theory and practice, offering an introductory session for new network members, and increasing staff participation in small-group discussions.

INTRODUCTION

In the summer of 1996, QUEST staff at the Appalachia Educational Laboratory (AEL) began working with teams from school communities in three West Virginia county school districts to invigorate efforts for continuous school improvement, using a variety of techniques for gathering input from all those with a stake in their local schools. This first "learning community," known as Leadership to Unify School Improvement Efforts (LUSIE), was comprised of school teams including students, teachers, administrators, parents, and community members. Ultimately, this group wrote school visions and improvement plans, and coauthored (with AEL) *Creating Energy for School Improvement* (1997), a supplemental guide for those poised to write their own state-mandated school improvement plans.

QUEST staff also planned to create learning communities devoted to exploring continuous school improvement across the four-state AEL Region. Hence, staff scheduled a pilot Inquiry Into Improvement conference in April 1997 in Johnson City, Tennessee, for selected Region high schools. Schools were selected in several ways. Some schools were recommended for the QUEST experience by central office staff or school administrators. Other schools were asked to join QUEST because they had participated in previous AEL programs. Still other schools were invited because staff believed they were primed for the kind of collaborative inquiries into school improvement that QUEST was designed to provide.

In October 1997, in Roanoke, Virginia, another conference was held for designated high schools in AEL's Region, this time with an explicit emphasis on forming and nurturing a network of high schools. The first conference for elementary schools was held in November 1997 in Nashville, Tennessee, intending to nurture a network for elementary schools. A second elementary "rally," as staff renamed the conferences, was convened February 22-24, 1998 in Lexington, Kentucky. This evaluation report describes and assesses this second rally for elementary schools, appraising the degree to which rally goals were met. These goals were (1) to reconnect with one another, individually and collectively, and as member schools; (2) to think, individually and collectively, about student learning; (3) to create a creed embodying shared beliefs about student learning; and (4) to commit to action in our respective school communities.

Of the 11 elementary schools that sent teams to the first rally, nine sent teams to the second. One school did not send a returning team because they had attended the first rally as a "storytelling school." This school was not within AEL's Region, but because of their involvement with another Lab's initiative to study and support professional learning communities, QUEST staff invited a team from the school to share their story of continuous improvement with rally participants. They did not intend to become part of the QUEST network. Another school was unable to attend but made explicit to QUEST staff that they wanted to continue their involvement with the network.

Thirty-nine people attended the second elementary school rally, 27 (69%) of whom had participated in the first. Broken down by role groups, seven principals, one assistant principal, one central office staff member, one community member, three support staff, eighteen teachers, and eight parents participated in the February rally.

The primary audience for this report is QUEST staff. It is intended to provide information for staff to draw upon as they make decisions about the project. Further, this report is one in a series that will document the evolution of the QUEST project. QUEST staff and others interested in network building or efforts to nurture and sustain continuous school improvement may find such documentation useful.

The purpose of this report is to assess whether, and to what extent, rally goals were met. In addition, this report discusses ways in which the February 1998 rally compared to the earlier QUEST conferences, as part of the ongoing documentation of network development. And the report finally attends to participants' assessments of the impact the conference had upon their schools, their QUEST teams, and their individual perceptions.

METHODOLOGY

The methods used for this evaluation component of the QUEST project were qualitative. During the rally, the evaluator engaged in participant observation (Becker & Geer, 1957; Emerson, 1983; Glazer, 1972; Hammersley & Atkinson, 1983; Miles & Huberman, 1994), a method highly suited "for studying processes, relationships among people and events, the organization of people and events, continuities over time, and patterns" (Jorgensen, 1989, p. 12). Furthermore, consistent with the QUEST paradigm, participant observation involves "a flexible, open-ended, opportunistic process and logic of inquiry through which what is studied constantly is subject to redefinition based on field experience and observation" (Jorgensen, 1989, p. 23). This method "is a commitment to adopt the perspective of those studied by sharing in their . . . . experiences" (Denzin, 1989, p. 156), thereby enabling researchers to evaluate how an event or process appears and feels to participants. And, finally, participant observation places the evaluator squarely in the field, rather than in the office or on the phone, allowing for the collection of richer, more directly acquired data (Patton, 1980).

The evaluator also conducted other data collection and analysis activities, a strategy called multimethod research, or triangulation. Multimethod research allows the investigator to "attack a research problem with an arsenal of methods that have nonoverlapping weaknesses in addition to their complementary strengths" (Brewer & Hunter, 1989, p. 17) in order to apprehend the subject of study more fully. Other methods used included the administration of feedback questionnaires and unstructured interviews. Almost entirely consistent across rallies, the feedback forms asked participants to respond to various prompts concerning the structure, content, and meaning of each rally (see Appendix A). Prompts that queried attendees about their evaluations of specific foci or activities were the only prompts modified prior to each rally. One evaluation form, containing six prompts, was distributed following the first day and a half of rally activity. Another form was distributed at the end of each rally. After feedback forms were collected, responses were analyzed by question and according to theme.

Participants responded to a pre-rally questionnaire, as well (see Appendix B). Administered just prior to the beginning of the rally, this questionnaire sought participants' perceptions about the impact the previous QUEST conference had--on individuals, within school teams, and in the larger school community. In addition, the questionnaire requested participants to describe the impact of the QUEST listserv. Finally, it asked respondents to discuss their expectations for the upcoming QUEST gathering.

Unstructured interviews were also conducted during the course of each rally. As opportunities arose for relatively private conversation, participants were asked to discuss their assessments of the rally, generally, and of the achievement of rally goals, specifically.

Additionally, QUEST listserv activity was monitored. Often, participants chose to communicate privately via E-mail with QUEST staff rather than with the entire network via the

listserv; these communications were reported to the evaluator. Other data came from QUEST staff following each rally during "debriefing" activities; staff shared their assessments of the rally and reported interactions with participants they found significant.

Finally, three months after the rally, participants responded to a mailed follow-up questionnaire (see Appendix C). Sent to all who attended the February rally, the questionnaire asked respondents to discuss the rally's impact upon them at the individual level. It also asked respondents to describe what activities, if any, their QUEST team had engaged in following the rally; what changes, if any, had taken place within their schools due to participation in QUEST; the extent and nature of communication with QUEST participants from other schools; and suggestions for the improvement of QUEST itself. Participants were sent three letters over the course of three months reminding them to return their completed questionnaires to the QUEST evaluator if they had not already done so.

Analyses of participant observation field notes, interview data, evaluation forms, follow-up forms, and QUEST communications were made by question, but more often by theme.

RALLY ACTIVITIES

This section provides a detailed description of rally activities. It is intended to provide a fuller account of the work in which QUEST staff and participants engaged than a brief summary of events might offer.

Day One

Participants in the second QUEST elementary school rally began arriving on Sunday, February 22, 1998, at the Harley Hotel in Lexington, Kentucky. The conference room they entered, beginning at approximately 3:00 in the afternoon, had been decorated by QUEST staff with posters of thought-provoking quotations pertinent to continuous school improvement (e.g. "'Let us view understanding not as a state of possession but one of enablement' --David Perkins"), tables lined with a variety of education resources and books, and large pieces of butcher paper ready for use. Attendees were assigned to one of six tables around the room; each table accommodated an inquiry group comprised of six or seven participants from various role groups and schools. On these tables were name placards, small colorful windcatchers, pens and paper, and a basket or two filled with post-its, pens, markers, tape, and other supplies. Classical music was played quietly in the background on a portable stereo.

Many of the participants greeted each other enthusiastically, some hugging, others reminding each other of their names and schools, nearly everyone smiling. The atmosphere thus created was friendly and welcoming. Some participants arrived in casual clothing, while others wore professional clothes. Unlike the previous elementary rally, two men attended the Lexington event--one, a principal; the other, a parent.

The facilitators began the rally activities at 3:50 with a welcome and introductions, although approximately 20 participants had not yet arrived. Staff then spent 15 minutes discussing their goals for the rally and the various ways in which attendees would be asked to group themselves during activities. After this orientation, participants engaged in an introductory activity designed to facilitate reconnections between attendees who had met at the earlier rally and introductions between those who were attending for the first time. Using prompts provided by QUEST staff, members in inquiry groups shared pieces of information about themselves. Participants appeared to find this task amusing; they laughed, squirmed in their chairs as they confronted a prompt they found challenging, leaned forward around tables to hear each others' revelations, and smiled encouragement as they listened to one another. Wrapping up this activity, staff asked representatives from each inquiry group to share with the whole group commonalities they had discovered during the introductory task.

Next, the facilitators described the context of QUEST, focusing on the project's mission, the conceptual framework of continuous improvement, the processes and products of QUEST, and a time line depicting project activities. Staff then asked attendees to read a vision of how a QUEST school might function in preparation to discuss which aspects of the vision they found most

compelling or significant. One group focused for some time on the value of a proactive faculty. A group member found this to be an important trait because "people continue on the path they're on until they hit a roadblock," suggesting that perhaps roadblocks could be preempted by proactive planning. Another person agreed: "It's easy to say it's not working. It's hard to say 'what do we do?'" As inquiry groups then reported out to the whole group about their discussions, one participant said, focusing on proactivity, "People wait until the roof falls in rather than fixing the hole. Then you wonder why you're wet. So it's important to act before there's a crisis." Later the discussion turned to the equally dangerous trend of accepting innovations without reflection and needs assessments. A participant explained, "It's good to be proactive, but not at the expense of older ideas," implying that some such ideas were valuable.

Staff then requested that attendees convene with their school teams to discuss what they had accomplished since the last rally. The evaluator listened to two school teams during this activity. One group thought that they had given their school a "shot in the arm," adding "energy and support" to their school improvement endeavors. In a second group, a teacher discussed with frustration her pessimism about change. Describing her many attempts to innovate, she finally said, "I've tried and tried and tried, and I'm at the point where I'm sick of it...And I'm not the only one who feels that way." The assistant principal replied, "But, see, it's not supposed to be that way." The teacher continued to share her discouragement feelingly for several more minutes. "I just wish we could get more together, more camaraderie, more respect," she explained. To which the assistant principal then said, "We need to find a common goal." The teacher countered, "People are afraid to really say what they think, so they splinter off into their little groups." This exchange was cut short as the facilitators asked teams to share reports of their accomplishments with the entire group.

Ironically, the school team including the frustrated teacher reported that they had worked to promote appreciation and recognition of teachers. Another school team described having scaled-up their Microsociety program, instituted after-school tutoring, and convened a study group on brain-based learning. A third school had evaluated all their programs and modified those in need. In addition, this school had converted their teachers' lounge into an additional classroom and created For Our Children's Unconditional Success (FOCUS), an after-school homework help line. A fourth school had described their QUEST experience at PTO and faculty meetings, and had developed and administered surveys to parents and teachers. Another school began holding morning meetings once a week for the entire school, held parent involvement meetings, and produced a video about their school community. This school also invited the principal from another QUEST school to share their story at a staff development meeting. A sixth school conducted a needs assessment, combining QUEST goals with their consolidated planning process. Likewise, one school noted that they had incorporated QUEST goals into their formal improvement plan. This school additionally surveyed its business partners, parents, faculty, and central office staff and eventually developed a mission statement collaboratively with some of those surveyed. An eighth school instituted Monday meetings for the entire school and Wednesday breakfast meetings for staff. They reported that their principal also began writing a weekly memo to staff about school happenings, noting that "we're listening better [to each other]." Finally, school staff had also redesignated some of the space in their school, creating a "sick room" for ill students and a room for teachers' aides. The last school had

conducted a climate survey and a needs assessment for their consolidated planning efforts, and had reorganized their primary school.

After these reports, participants were involved in an activity called Data on Display, which allowed them to aggregate their answers to several questions concerning student learning and create a chart depicting such data. As participants finished making the chart, one person said, "That's a real cute idea." Staff then allotted 15 minutes for attendees to first individually analyze the data and then discuss the implications of the data collectively within inquiry groups. Some groups had difficulty with this task, generally because they appeared unsure that their interpretations of the questions were correct. When asked to share their conclusions with the whole group, one inquiry group member asked, "How *do* you define a successful learner?" This was met with much laughter and some clapping; approximately 15 participants raised their hands indicating that they had been wrestling with this issue as well. The facilitators then noted that interpretation is an inevitable part of data analysis, but one which could be taken advantage of in action research: "If you do action research, you have to determine what success is and how to measure it." A participant soon countered, "But sometimes that definition is taken away from you--state tests." Once it had been made explicit to attendees that interpretation was inevitable, they shared some of their conclusions about the data with the whole group. Staff then brought the day to a close, announcing the evening activities and summing up the work that had been accomplished during the rally thus far.

Day Two

The next day of activity began with participants in role-alike groups; school administrators sat at one table, parents at another, the 18 teachers at several tables. After a few minutes devoted to journal writing, staff introduced the QUEST Scholars program--an opportunity for 12 participants to collaborate with QUEST staff in researching ongoing school improvement--and invited participants to consider applying. Next, participants in role-alike groups spent several minutes becoming acquainted using prompts provided by staff before moving onto the next task.

Staff asked groups to discuss and aggregate the answers they had received to an interview protocol on successful learners sent to participants prior to the rally. Using data from the aggregated interviews, participants generated a Mindmap on successful student learning and then continued their analyses of the interview data.

Based on comments from participants after finishing the Data on Display activity the previous day, QUEST staff had attendees engage in the activity again, this time with Post-it notes color coordinated by the participants' role. Several minutes were spent analyzing the new data. Interestingly, in response to one of the questions, teachers appeared to believe that teachers had less influence on student success than, for instance, student responsibility, parent involvement, or administrative support.

The next task asked participants to query one another about successful student learning more reflectively, making sure that assumptions were articulated and claims clearly supported. Staff

provided attendees with several tools to achieve more thorough inquiry, including a variety of prompts and a visual depiction of how conclusions are reached when serious reflection is *not* embedded in the process. Some groups appeared to use the protocols, but one group made only a brief attempt to incorporate the prompts into their discussion before abandoning them altogether for the apparently more comfortable swapping of stories. However, this group claimed that the protocols had been helpful: "We were giving more information," a group member said. When asked how using the protocols had felt, she replied, "Good. Informative." Other groups felt, for example, that "We listened better" or "It made us think about where the other person was coming from." Another group member revealed, "I'm not sure we focused so much on the protocol as on the content." Staff acknowledged that, "Yes, it's awkward. It's artificial in the beginning."

The facilitators guided attendees onto the next task, which utilized a process called Snowflake. Participants first spent time in their inquiry groups brainstorming about what supports student learning, writing each brainstormed idea on a Post-it note. Staff then collected these notes and began the process of categorizing the compiled ideas by group consent. While some attendees became restless during this activity (categorization took 25 minutes), particularly as differing perspectives on the meaning of categories emerged, it provided the conceptual basis for a creed writing activity scheduled for the next day.

Before adjourning for lunch, staff requested that participants prepare for work in "expert" groups by choosing one of the constructs embedded in the SMART learner acronym (Successful, Motivated, Autonomous, Responsible, Thoughtful), one of the six major components of the QUEST framework for continuous improvement. This notion, project staff conjecture, is an essential element in focusing school improvement efforts. After reading a selection in their QUEST notebooks about their chosen SMART traits, participants were to break for lunch. Attendees quickly chose constructs, read selections, and then left for their meal.

After the break, participants met in groups focusing on one of the SMART traits. They discussed the significance of each characteristic to successful student learning. Few people chose to focus on thoughtfulness, while many participants were concerned with responsibility.

Staff then revealed that one of the school teams would be sharing the story of their school's improvement efforts. Before the storytelling school began, attendees were asked to keep in mind their discussion of SMART traits and to approach the story as "a way of learning together in community," as a "window" into another school's experiences, and as a "mirror" reflecting their own experiences. Participants then sat in a large circle as the storytelling team told their story, which revolved around inclusion.

Afterwards, staff requested that participants ask any clarifying questions they might have of the storytelling team. Some queries centered on *how* the school's inclusion strategy had been planned and implemented. Other questions had to do with overcoming opposition and empowering staff. After 20 minutes of questioning, participants took a break before returning to their "expert" groups. Upon returning, their task was to write a more probing, analytical question based on their

trait discussions to pose to the storytelling team. After composing a question, each group then wrote it on butcher paper. The questions that were crafted included: "In what ways has inclusion promoted responsibility among your faculty?" "What mechanisms do you have to evaluate that the needs of higher achievers are being met and challenged?" "How do you measure whether the children are successful, and how do you define successful?" The storytelling team spent 15 minutes answering one of the questions and contributing to a discussion of autonomous learning within the context of inclusion.

Back in their inquiry groups, participants watched excerpts from two videotapes (*Mr. Holland's Opus* and *Good Morning, Miss Tolliver*). Staff directed attendees to discuss what appeared to support student learning in these videos and write their conclusions on Post-it notes for adding to the Snowflake categories.

As people finished categorizing the remaining Post-it notes, staff previewed the next day's agenda and discussed the evening's optional recreational activities. The day adjourned with a reading assignment and a handout concerning Comprehensive School Reform opportunities.

Day Three

On the last morning of the rally, participants gathered for breakfast in the conference room, where they were directed to sit with their school teams. Energetic music was played in the background. After breakfast, staff reviewed the rally goals and some of the feedback they had received about the rally proceedings thus far. Then staff asked school teams to consider all of the activities and processes they had been engaged in over the course of the rally as possible tools they might use back in their school communities. Participants were also to think about how they might use such tools and for what purposes. One school team considered using storytelling at the beginning of each faculty meeting, with individuals sharing stories about their experiences. The principal suggested it might be awkward at first, but that school staff would likely eventually adjust to the process. The team also discussed their school culture, in which sharing successes is considered inappropriate and arrogant; successful teachers may become pariahs and hence teachers preempt such status by apologizing for their success. As one teacher phrased it, "When we're doing interesting things, we don't affirm them publicly." Teachers also were concerned not to appear critical of each other by discussing their innovations or accomplishments. The team then considered various strategies for arranging storytelling activities that would not reinforce the school culture of reticence and self-deprecation, including drawing names randomly each week for storytelling.

QUEST staff distributed to each school the results from their administration of the Hord School Professional Staff as Learning Community instrument. Attendees spent about 20 minutes discussing the implications of their results and the potential ways in which the data might be used in their school communities. Meanwhile, the facilitators visited each school team, offering suggestions at times about how schools might find the results helpful.

After a brief introduction of a new QUEST opportunity, the summer symposia (events consisting of more conventional training on various educational topics), staff gave instructions for the next activity. Participants were given a handout of 12 principles of brain-based learning written by Caine and Caine (1991). Twelve groups were created, one for each principle. These groups were then to read their assigned principle and create a visual presentation, one-minute skit, or poster representing that principle.

The next 20 minutes were devoted to group presentations. One skit, for instance, focusing on the principle that "learning always involves conscious and unconscious processes" (Caine & Caine, 1991, pp. 84-85), began with a teacher introducing nonsense words to a class. The meanings of the words were conveyed first by the teacher demonstrating the actions meant to be communicated by such words and then by asking each student to repeat the words as she too engaged in the actions indicated by the words. Afterwards, the teacher asked the students what they thought the words meant; their answers were correct. The presenters then briefly discussed the ways in which physical movement provided an unconscious basis for conscious learning.

After the presentations concluded, staff moved to the next activity, which asked each of the 12 groups to choose a Snowflake category and create a creed about student learning based upon the content of each category. Staff allotted an hour for this task, hotel checkout, and a break; many groups finished writing their creeds within 20 minutes.

When the rally reconvened, participants read their creeds, which they had written on butcher paper. Staff created the sense that this was an exciting event and an accomplishment, the result of two days of hard work. "Do we believe?" one staff member asked the whole group after the presentation of each statement. "We believe!" many attendees shouted in return.

After the presentation of creed statements, staff introduced action research as a systematic, schoolwide improvement venture. To follow up, they showed a video depicting the action research process as played out in one school and then asked teams to examine ways in which action research might be useful in their own schools. Participants shared their thoughts about action research. One attendee noted that she appreciated how the school depicted in the video "had a goal they worked toward. But they brought closure . . . . not really closure, but they got feedback on the effect" of the innovation under study. "And then they continued" the cycle of research, another participant added. Still another attendee said, "I was impressed with the long term collaboration and commitment . . . . somehow it kept up the spirit and energy."

Following a break for lunch, during which two school teams departed (both due to unexpected emergencies), participants reenergized with an activity called Forks and Spoons, which involved passing forks and spoons in a circle according to a complicated pattern of asking what each utensil was. Afterwards, attendees listened as staff shared another new QUEST opportunity--QUEST site visits to each school. Returning to the theme of action research, the facilitators asked attendees to discuss what action research projects their schools might find fruitful to undertake and then "make a solid action plan." During this activity, staff visited each table, offering support and

guidance if needed. In one group, a previously pessimistic and exhausted teacher became enthusiastic about the action research her team was considering: "It's scary going into the lion pit. I mean, my heart's beating. I'm fired up!"

QUEST staff requested that school teams report their plans to the whole group. One team hoped to communicate what they had gained from their QUEST experience during team meetings back at their schools. During these meetings they also planned to introduce the notion of action research, proposing it as a feasible activity and asking colleagues to consider choosing a focus for the research cycle. Another school wanted to examine the impact of their staff development and school improvement efforts on reading skills. The team planned to discuss data collection at their next faculty meeting. A third school planned to conduct a workshop for their faculty on successful student learning before organizing an action research plan. One school was preparing to institute a new reading program, Accelerated Reader, during the next school year. Hoping to study the impact of the new program on reading scores, they intended to collect baseline data during the remainder of this year. A fifth school felt that they had introduced too many new ideas to their faculty already. Rather than plan a research project just yet, the team wanted to first "take stock" of the school's accomplishments before committing to an action plan. Another school was concerned "not to ask staff to do more than they're doing," because the school was involved in several major initiatives already. Instead, the team planned to incorporate any action research into preexisting projects. In addition, they wanted to spend some time with their school community setting goals, establishing a vision, and planning for action. The final school reported that they intended to share the results from the Hord School Professional Staff as Learning Community instrument with their school. In terms of action research, they had formulated several research questions that they planned to pose to their faculty for consideration as foci for a schoolwide study. These questions included: "Do parents and students understand our assessment system?" "What is the impact of Microsociety on student achievement?" and "What are we doing, and what can we do better, for early childhood?" This team also considered collecting student stories about education.

The facilitators then reminded interested attendees to apply to the QUEST Scholars program and thanked everyone for participating. Amidst clapping, the facilitators thanked each other, and the participants also expressed their appreciation for QUEST staff's efforts. An attendee made an announcement about a training opportunity, staff handed out evaluation forms for participants to complete, and the rally came to a close.

FINDINGS

Comparative Findings

The second elementary rally differed from the earlier conference in several ways. First, participants came to the second rally with a burgeoning sense of continuity, reflected in the language they used in response to a pre-rally questionnaire item asking, "As you think about the journey of continuous improvement in your school, what do you hope for from this QUEST rally?" Twenty-four participants replied to this query, nine (38%) of whom referred to the ongoing support they hoped to receive during the second QUEST rally. For instance, one participant wrote that she wanted a "reinjection of spirit and resolve. We got off to a good start but need to recharge." Others hoped to obtain "continued" or "more" ideas, while another attendee wanted to "continue to be positive." The ways in which participants phrased their expectations suggest that they felt the QUEST experience to be ongoing rather than singular.

A second difference between the elementary rallies involved school teams' communication at the second rally of the dividends, so to speak, of their involvement with QUEST. When asked to describe what their schools had accomplished since the earlier rally, all participants had at least one achievement to report. Asked on the pre-rally questionnaire what their schools or school teams had accomplished as a result of participating in the previous conference, 16 (76%) of the 21 respondents who had attended the earlier rally noted various initiatives they attributed to support they received from QUEST. These initiatives included, for instance, a parent involvement program, needs assessments, regular school community meetings, and an evaluation and modification of school programs.

Third, the conceptual focus of the second elementary rally differed from that of the first. Whereas the first conference emphasized school culture, learning community, and shared leadership, the second centered on student learning. Consequently, participants spent a greater amount of time discussing the primary beneficiaries of education endeavors. As one attendee said it, "Where else should educators focus if not on producing student success?"

The elementary rally also differed from the QUEST high school rallies. In some ways, elementary school participants appeared more attuned to the QUEST philosophy. As one QUEST staff member stated it, "This elementary group was an 'easier' group, it seemed. They had really connected with one another in Nashville; I wasn't worried about having to 'convince' them that QUEST was a good thing for them. They seemed pretty well convinced."

Different from the high school rallies and similar to the first elementary school rally, this elementary gathering consisted almost entirely of women, with only two men attending. Another similarity with the previous elementary conference was the use of storytelling as a means to explore continuous school improvement.

Achievement of Rally Goals

QUEST staff presented participants with four goals for the rally: (1) to reconnect with one another, individually and collectively, and as member schools; (2) to think, individually and collectively, about student learning; (3) to create a creed embodying shared beliefs about student learning; and (4) to commit to action in our respective school communities. The four goals differed slightly from the six goals presented at the previous elementary school rally in Nashville, Tennessee. These earlier goals were to (1) connect with colleagues, (2) create a learning community, (3) connect with concepts and stories related to continuous school improvement, (4) create personal and shared meaning, (5) commit to continue learning with this community, and (6) commit to continue the QUEST back home. The revised goals were more relevant to the activities and circumstances of the Lexington rally. That is, participants who had attended a previous QUEST rally would be reacquainting themselves with other participants who had also attended the earlier rally. The conceptual focus of this rally differed as well, with a concentration on student learning rather than on an introduction to the QUEST framework. Part of this work included participant creation of creeds articulating beliefs about what supports student learning. The final revised goal differed slightly from the earlier goals relating to action, with an emphasis placed upon participants committing to action in their schools. Hence the goals for this rally were germane to its focus and context.

Participants were asked to complete evaluation questionnaires with open-ended prompts concerning the achievement of rally goals. Of the 39 participants, 35 returned the evaluation form distributed after the first day and a half of rally activities, a return rate of 90%. Twenty-four attendees completed the final evaluation form distributed at the end of the rally, a 62% return rate.

Goal One: Reconnect with One Another

On the final evaluation questionnaire, 11 (46%) of the 24 who responded to the prompt "I connected with . . . ." wrote about meeting other educators or reacquainting themselves with participants who had attended the conference in Nashville; the remainder wrote of connecting with various ideas or a sense of purpose. For instance, one respondent wrote that she connected with "many old and new friends. I always come back full of ideas and energy," emphasizing that she felt rejuvenated by such encounters with colleagues. One attendee said that she had connected with "everybody here. I grow in appreciation of the diversity of situations and the incredible creativity and courage people show in their situations," while another responded that she enjoyed meeting "other individuals who had the same interest and concerns as myself."

Likewise, in interviews and during rally activities, participants showed or spoke of their reconnection with one another. As attendees arrived in the conference room for the rally, many exchanged friendly greetings and even hugs. One participant pointed out a school team to a fellow school team member, exclaiming, "See, I told ya! They came last time." Several participants shared updates with each other about their families and school activities.

New QUEST participants also found attendees with whom they were able to make connections. In an impromptu interview with the evaluator, a freshman teacher said of her QUEST experience, "It's interesting. It's nice to hear what older teachers think. I like to learn and hear different ideas." Her comments suggest that she felt invigorated by the informal mentoring that she received during the rally.

On the other hand, some attendees reported that connecting with others was sometimes hampered. In response to the prompt "Things that would have allowed me to contribute more. . . .," one such participant wrote, "Most discussions were very superficial. No time to explore or discuss in depth," adding "[I] do not feel the 'point' was ever made." Similarly, another participant felt that there was too much "off task discussion." One respondent faulted personality, writing that "one member felt the need to 'be right' which cut me off for conversation." During an impromptu interview with the evaluator, an attendee reported feeling discouraged because she felt her ideas were too different from other participants' ideas. As a result, her contributions did not receive serious consideration during inquiry group activities, and she eventually made fewer of them.

Other participants noted that lack of time inhibited discussion. For example, one respondent wrote, "the fast paced schedule of one thing moving directly into another one cut off some important discussions." Similarly, in reply to the prompt, "Things to trash . . . . ," another attendee suggested that QUEST staff "trim your plate," implying that too many activities had been scheduled.

Goal Two: Think about Student Learning

Of the 24 attendees who responded to the final evaluation questionnaire, 16 (67%) felt that the focus on student learning was useful and appropriate. "Where else should educators focus if not on producing student success?" asked one respondent rhetorically. Another wrote that the student learning focus "stimulated my thinking and expanded my realization that different stakeholder groups see things differently." Yet another thought that "this was excellent. It is important for individuals to step back and dissect what we think" successful student learning is.

Four (17%) respondents did not reply to the prompt concerning the rally focus on student learning. Three (13%) respondents gave critical assessments: one participant felt that she "did not benefit from this as much," while two others thought that more time ought to have been devoted to elaborating the QUEST concept of SMART learners. One response to this query did not address the focus on student learning at all.

Of the 35 attendees who responded to the mid-rally evaluation form prompt "Learnings, insights, ah-ha's from the day . . . . ," 12 (34%) noted the experience of thinking about student learning. For instance, one respondent wrote, "We dissect so many things and aspects of learning, but they really are very connected and built on one another." Another wrote that she had "a more definite definition of a successful learner. Also a better understanding and ideas of what can enhance learning." One participant felt that "defining 'successful learner' is a very hard task and many

considerations need to be explored." Another respondent emphasized the necessity of delineating what constitutes student success, writing that there could be "no success until it's defined."

Goal Three: Create a Creed Embodying Shared Beliefs about Student Learning

Participants' inquiries into student learning led to the development of creeds, which are as follows.

- We believe that each student is a unique individual to be accepted unconditionally, listened to, and encouraged. We will create ways for each child to grow, so that he/she may be a joint-participant in the learning process.
- We believe that for individuals to become successful learners: They must have at least one advocate in their lives. They must demonstrate responsibility, respect, citizenship, caring, trustworthiness, and fairness.
- All children CAN LEARN! We will provide an environment, which is high in expectations and that will stimulate all students to develop in their time to their fullest capacity.
- We believe in order for a child to be available to learn, there must be a feeling of security in the home, school, and community.
- We believe that student learning is enhanced when the teacher models real life storytelling experiences. This brings out creativity and enthusiasm.
- We believe that successful learning requires a school and classroom climate that cultivates curiosity for meaningful learning through exploration with active participation, provides mutual respect in an open and caring environment with committed and enthusiastic teachers.
- We believe in providing many opportunities for student learning utilizing a variety of teaching strategies which [sic] establish high expectations and meet individual needs.
- We believe that pre-assessment of student knowledge before teaching new information is vital to student learning. Assessment must be used in order to determine adequate time to absorb new information.
- We believe that parental involvement is essential to successful student learning. The lines of communication must stay open between the teacher, students, and parents.
- We believe effective school, parent, and community communication is essential for optimal student learning.
- We believe that the teacher needs the faith and support of her administrator that allows her to make decisions about what is best for her students and her classroom, to view her as an equal, and to assist her when she needs help.
- Ongoing professional development is essential to the educational process. Focused and relevant professional training provides the reflection, connection, and restoration necessary for lifelong learning.

While 11 (46%) participants responded to the prompt on the final evaluation form, "I connected with . . . ." in terms of personal interactions with other participants, three (13%) reported that they had connected with the creeds. In response to the prompt "I was personally renewed by . . . .," two attendees mentioned the creeds. One extemporaneous comment dealt with the significance of the creed writing activities: "'Creed' work was very meaningful. Look forward to receiving a compilation, would like to do this with our faculty." Not only were the creeds immediately meaningful, according to this participant, the process whereby they were created might prove valuable for her school community as well. Hence, participants did create creeds reflecting their shared beliefs, an activity that a few attendees found especially worthwhile.

Although participants generally found the final creeds to be significant, when asked what about the rally they might "trash," four reported that the Snowflake activity that informed the writing of creeds was tedious. For instance, one attendee wrote, "Too much time was spent on classifying [Snowflake categories]. I didn't see or understand what was the point to spend more than 15 minutes on it." This participant not only thought the process took too much time to complete, she also seemed unaware that the Snowflake categories would later be used to create creeds. Two others reported that the activity consumed too much time, but ultimately felt that it needn't be "trashed."

Goal Four: Commit to Action

Participants indicated their commitment to action in several ways. In response to the prompt "I am committed to . . . ." on the final evaluation form, 22 of the 24 respondents (92%) wrote about various foci for action. Five of these noted their intentions to engage in action research and, as one respondent put it, "data driven work." Eight respondents indicated that they were committed to creating better schools and improving student learning, while three felt they first needed to encourage their schools to focus on an issue or a problem before planning action. Others provided more general accounts of their commitment. For instance, one respondent noted that she was committed to "making a difference when I get back" to school.

QUEST staff provided time on the last day of the rally for school teams to discuss how they might use the data generated from their administrations of Shirley Hord's instrument for assessing "the maturity of a school's professional staff as a learning community" (Meehan, Orletsky, & Sattes, 1997). As communicated to QUEST staff, one school was prompted to act because of their data results. "When they looked at the results of the Hord instrument, the low scores on item 4 (peer observations) really got them. (All of their other items were really high.) They have decided to do peer observations this spring. They are waiting to let their entire faculty help select the action research question for further study. But they know they are going to proceed on the other now."

At the conclusion of the rally, school teams were asked to share their action plans. These action plans varied widely. Several schools hoped to discuss foci for action research with their faculty, while several more had already chosen what they believed to be viable research questions. One school, for example, planned to collect baseline data on student reading scores before they

began a new reading program the following year. They intended to assess the impact of this new program on students' reading abilities. Two schools planned to share some of their QUEST learnings with faculty. One school wanted to conduct a needs assessment. Another intended to set goals and create a vision before planning action.

Participants expressed enthusiasm for their action plans. One teacher exclaimed, "I'm fired up!" in reference to the plans her school team had made. During activities meant to encourage action planning, school teams discussed ways in which their schools could be improved and then considered various means by which to nurture improvement. Some school teams focused specifically on ways to overcome resistance or to facilitate "buy in" from their school communities.

Participants also shared the ways in which they felt QUEST had inspired them to action. In an E-mail to QUEST staff, one principal wrote, "Regardless of the paper outcomes of the rally, you have to know that each of us is forever changed for having participated in that shared learning time. Thank you for the insights and thought provoking queries. It is the seeds of discomfiture that were planted which [sic] will probably bear the most striking blooms. It's good to be reminded that there are many ways of doing and for me, at least, the joy is in the journey, not in reaching a single destination."

Follow-Up

One month after the rally, participants were mailed a follow-up evaluation form. Three letters were sent over the course of the next three months reminding those who had not returned their completed forms to do so. Of the total 39 participants, only 15 completed the follow-up feedback form, a return rate of 38%.

Participants were asked what they had gained personally from attending the February rally. Several made multiple responses. Nine respondents replied that they had learned new information or had acquired new ideas; several of these respondents further said that these benefits were gained while interacting with other participants at the rally. Three noted that they had gained emotional benefits: "courage and motivation," "excited," and "personal renewal." Other comments were unique. For instance, one participant said that she had gained a "better relationship with the two teachers on our [QUEST] team." Another reported that she had learned "that changes can be made positively--not negatively," while yet another wrote that she was now more interested in research on brain-based learning. "I began researching parent involvement for my thesis to help our school," wrote one participant.

QUEST members were then asked what activities or discussions their QUEST teams had undertaken since the rally. Again, some participants provided multiple answers. Two respondents reported that their teams had met and held discussions; the content of such discussions was not described. One participant said that her teams met to discuss "'process' of faculty meetings." Three participants replied more concretely, writing that their teams had convened in order to plan various

activities. Six others reported that their teams met to plan activities, and had then implemented their plans to various degrees. One participant said that her team had begun to collect baseline data for an action research project. Two participants reported meeting to discuss a book their team was reading, while another had prepared for a co-venture with AEL staff. However, one respondent wrote that her QUEST team had not met at all, and two others suggested that their school climates had been unsupportive. One such participant, although she had participated in a co-venture, reported that support for her school's participation in QUEST "seems to be fizzling out." She attributed this to "conflicts and misinterpretations on the part of principal and central office." The other respondent said, "We are not functioning well as a school right now. We are inspired by the ideals promoted through QUEST, but once we leave the conference we tend to fall back into old patterns." For these two participants, then, the rally had not engendered further QUEST school team action.

Participants described a number of changes that had taken place in their schools due to participation in QUEST. Five reported that they had begun weekly morning meetings for the entire school (these five may have been employed at the same school, but the follow-up forms did not solicit this information). Five respondents also indicated various planning activities their schools had undertaken. Four mentioned specific changes, although only two could be characterized as school improvement efforts. One of these respondents reported that "we have reconfigured K-1 and moved toward multi-age" instruction. The other listed the institution of parent involvement meetings and new staff development that was made available. Two respondents offered that their schools' climates had changed somewhat. For example, one participant reported "somewhat better schoolwide communication," while another described "more collaboration and open discussion." Others mentioned changes such as "our principal is looking for ways to incorporate storytelling more" and "We are more concerned about what our teaching strategies do to effect the brain development." While the February rally did not focus centrally on either of these themes, the participants seem to have found support for their interests in that context.

Six participants reported that they had not been in contact with QUEST members from other schools since the February rally. Four said that they had been in contact with others by E-mail. However, they did not specify whether they had simply received messages over the QUEST listserv, or had ongoing exchanges with other members privately. (From the middle of February to the first week in August, five QUEST members--only two of whom were affiliated with elementary schools--sent a total of seven messages to the listserv, the majority of which addressed QUEST staff and concerned the logistics of upcoming events. Staff sent a total of 27 messages to the QUEST listserv during this time.) One respondent reported that she "visited another school to provide staff development in various school improvement activities," while another wrote "we conducted a workshop for Wheatville (pseudonym)." Three wrote that they made plans to visit another QUEST school; two of these respondents also reported sharing information with other network members. Another participant said simply, "our school has [been in contact]." In sum, six participants reported having had no contact with other network members, while the remaining nine wrote of having been in some contact, ranging from receiving E-mail messages to providing workshops. Three of these reported having had several types of contacts.

When asked what might facilitate their contact with other network members, participants provided a number of suggestions. These included, "developing a self-improvement plan that includes contacting other QUEST participants," "follow-up newsletter," and "a specific reason to be in touch." Other responses suggested that more time and funding were necessary.

Participants also provided suggestions for the improvement of QUEST in general. Three felt that the pace of rally activities ought to be slowed; one of these suggested that the network focus on only one component of the QUEST framework each year. Two respondents reported that the ambiguity of QUEST was problematic; "A more defined road map would be useful," said one. Other responses were unique. One participant wrote, "So much time and energy is spent on philosophical and ideological matters. I think by the time the program moves to sharing about our schools or discussing actual situations and concerns practically--time expires, people leave, and we are tired." Another suggested that new network members might find an introduction to QUEST helpful, because "if you are a first timer or if you are not familiar with some of the lingo, it is off-putting in the beginning." Remembering the material covered during QUEST events was a issue for one respondent, while another wished more network members would communicate via the listserv. One participant wrote that while she had no criticisms of QUEST, "site visitations would be nice."

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

Several conclusions about the elementary school rally can be drawn from the data.

Most participants appeared to connect well with each other. Further, they valued such connections with one another highly. However, not all connections were unproblematic. Interpersonal dynamics were sometimes troubled by, for instance, an inability to tolerate divergent perspectives; some participants reported that discussions were superficial or brief; and limited time constrained full exploration of some topics.

Most participants thought the rally focus on student learning was appropriate and useful. While many reported that the SMART learner notion helped them think seriously about student learning, a few others would have preferred further elaboration on the theme.

Attendees created creeds embodying their collective beliefs about student learning. Most participants appeared to find this activity invigorating and meaningful. However, several felt the activity leading to the writing of creeds was tedious; one participant even appeared not to be aware of the significance of the activity for work later in the rally.

Not only did most attendees report being committed to taking action in their schools, they also reported specific foci for their action. These ranged from preliminary discussions with faculty concerning action research topics to collecting baseline data on research questions.

Follow-up data indicate that most respondents thought that they and their schools continued to reap benefits from participation in the rally, ranging from personal renewal to professional development provided by other network members. A few reported initiating what might be considered school improvement activities. Still, many respondents thought that QUEST could be improved in several ways.

Recommendations

Data from participant observation, evaluation questionnaires, informal interviews, listserv activity, and a follow-up form lead to several recommendations.

The QUEST listserv continues to be underutilized by network members. Although not all participants have access to the Internet, those who do could be encouraged to communicate via the listserv. Several participants suggested that such underutilization might be remedied by mandating participation. Other, less authoritarian, strategies to increase listserv communication include offering incentives for participation and hosting virtual meetings in which network members and staff agree in advance to log in simultaneously. Although communication during virtual meetings is not instantaneous, E-mail sent during these times can generally be received within minutes and a discussion can thus be simulated.

A recurring criticism was that time for discussion was limited at the rally, that the "pace" was overly rigorous. QUEST staff may consider offering fewer activities at upcoming events or providing more time for group activities. Of, if staff have a rationale for offering a fast-paced rally, they might share this with participants.

Some participants reported that QUEST activities were overly theoretical and therefore gave short shrift to practical matters. QUEST staff might consider clarifying the reasons they think such theoretical work is necessary to network members. In addition, they may want to moderate discussions concerning the relationship between theory and practice. Such discussions could serve two purposes: they might reveal to QUEST staff the substance of participants' discomfort, which could then be addressed, and they could be used to explore continuous school improvement further.

On the other extreme, a few participants thought that some discussions were superficial or did not address the relevant topics. If, as the rally goals suggest, QUEST staff intend that participants think deeply together about issues of school improvement, they may need to monitor or participate in discussions to ensure focus and rigor. Likewise, increased staff participation might encourage the habit of inquiry, in which participants spend less time defending their beliefs and more time asking questions from "a place of genuine not-knowing," as staff put it.

QUEST staff could consider designing an introductory session at project events for new members. This session would familiarize participants with QUEST's mission, the framework for continuous improvement, QUEST norms, and project activities to date. This might make initial QUEST activities less "off-putting" for new attendees. Such a session could also be designed to update network members who have been unable to attend all QUEST events.

Several participants reported that the Snowflake activity took too much time. If QUEST staff plan to use this process at other events, they may want to consider limiting the amount of time devoted to its completion. Further, at least one participant appeared unaware how this activity informed later activities. Staff may consider making relationships between rally activities even more explicit to participants.

REFERENCES

Appalachia Educational Laboratory. (1997). *Creating energy for school improvement*. Charleston, WV: Author.

Becker, H. S., & Geer, B. (1957). Participant observation and interviewing: A comparison. *Human Organization, 16*, 28-32.

Brewer, J., & Hunter, A. (1989). *Multimethod research: A synthesis of styles*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Caine, R. N., & Caine, G. (1991). *Making connections: Teaching and the human brain*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Denzin, N. K. (1989). *The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Emerson, R. M. (1983). *Contemporary field research: A collection of readings*. Prospect Heights: Waveland Press.

Glazer, M. (1972). *The research adventure: Promise and problems of fieldwork*. New York: Random House.

Hammersley, M., & Atkinson, P. (1983). *Ethnography: Principles in practice*. New York: Routledge.

Jorgensen, D. L. (1989). *Participant observation: A methodology for human studies*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Meehan, M. L., Orletsky, S. R., & Sattes, B. (1997). *Field test of an instrument measuring the concept of professional learning communities in schools*. Charleston, WV: Appalachia Educational Laboratory.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Patton, M. Q. (1980). *Qualitative Evaluation Methods*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A:

Feedback Forms

Inquiry Into Improvment
Feedback Form

The conference planners would appreciate your comments based upon the first day's experience.

Learnings, insights, ah-ha's from the day...

Things that worked especially well for me...

Ways in which I contributed...

Things that would have allowed me to contribute more...

Things I want to explore further...

Things to trash...

Other comments:

Inquiry Into Improvment

Please give us your feedback about the conference. In the top four boxes, we are asking for your reaction to four different experiences offered at the conference. How did the following "work" for you:

Inquiry group?	Storytelling as a Learning Tool?
School stories?	Home school team meetings?

In the bottom four boxes, we invite your comments to the following prompts:

I was personally renewed by...	My curiousity was piqued about...
I connected with...	I am committed to...

Use the back side of this paper to write other comments.

APPENDIX B:

Pre-Rally Questionnaire

Pre-Conference Questionnaire
QUEST Elementary Network
Lexington, Kentucky
February 22 - 24, 1998

1. Did you attend the QUEST event in Nashville? _____

2. If you attended the Nashville QUEST conference/rally, what, if anything, did you learn from it? _____
_____
_____
_____

3. If you attended the Nashville QUEST conference/rally, what, if anything, have you or your QUEST team done as a result of participating? _____
_____
_____
_____
_____

4. Do you have access to the Internet? Yes___ No___

If no, skip to question 5.

If yes, have you been a part of the QUEST electronic listserv? Yes___ No___

If yes, in what ways, if at all, has the listserv affected you? _____
_____
_____
_____
_____

If no, would you like to participate on the electronic listserv? (Participation means that you could receive and send messages to other QUEST network members.)
Yes___ No___

If yes, please provide your name and E-mail address: _____
_____

5. As you think about the journey of continuous improvement in your school, what do you hope for from this QUEST rally? _____
_____
_____

APPENDIX C:

Follow-Up Questionnaire

QUEST Follow Up
Elementary School Network

As you may know, AEL staff are interested in continually improving QUEST, and your input helps us do that. Please take a few minutes to complete the following questionnaire and return it in the enclosed stamped envelope. Your responses will remain confidential. Thank you for your help!

1. Now that several months have passed since the last QUEST rally, what, if anything, have you gained personally from that experience?

2. If your school team has met since the last rally, please describe the activities and/or discussions you have had.

3. What, if any, changes have taken place in your school due to your school's participation in QUEST?

4. What criticisms or suggestions for improvement, if any, do you have of QUEST at this point?

5. To what extent, if at all, have you been in contact with QUESTers from other schools? By what means? And for what purposes?

(Over)

APPENDIX D:

Completed Evaluation *Standards* Checklist

Citation Form

The Program Evaluation Standards (1994, Sage) guided the development of this (check one):

_____ request for evaluation plan/design/proposal
_____ evaluation plan/design/proposal
_____ evaluation contract
__X__ evaluation report
_____ other: _____

To interpret the information provided on this form, the reader needs to refer to the full text of the standards as they appear in Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, *The Program Evaluation Standards* (1994), Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage.

The *Standards* were consulted and used as indicated in the table below (check as appropriate):

Descriptor		The Standard was deemed applicable and to the extent feasible was taken into account.	The Standard was deemed applicable but could not be taken into account.	The Standard was not deemed applicable.	Exception was taken to the Standard.
U1	Stakeholder Identification	X			
U2	Evaluator Credibility	X			
U3	Information Scope and Selection	X			
U4	Values Identification	X			
U5	Report Clarity	X			
U6	Report Timeliness and Dissemination	X			
U7	Evaluation Impact	X			
F1	Practical Procedures	X			
F2	Political Viability			X	
F3	Cost Effectiveness	X			
P1	Service Orientation	X			
P2	Formal Agreements	X			
P3	Rights of Human Subjects	X			
P4	Human Interactions	X			
P5	Complete and Fair Assessment	X			
P6	Disclosure of Findings	X			
P7	Conflict of Interest	X			
P8	Fiscal Responsibility	X			
A1	Program Documentation	X			
A2	Context Analysis	X			
A3	Described Purposes and Procedures	X			
A4	Defensible Information Sources	X			
A5	Valid Information	X			
A6	Reliable Information	X			
A7	Systematic Information	X			
A8	Analysis of Quantitative Information			X	
A9	Analysis of Qualitative Information	X			
A10	Justified Conclusions	X			
A11	Impartial Reporting	X			
A12	Metaevaluation	X			

Name (typed) Caitlin Howley-Rowe Date: 8/18/98

(signature) Caitlin Howley-Rowe

Position or Title: Research Assistant

Agency: Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc.

Address: P.O. Box 1348, Charleston, WV 25325-1348

Relation to Document: Author

(e.g., author of document, evaluation team leader, external auditor, internal auditor)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE